

IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL VERIFICATION AGENCIES

A. NATIONAL AGENCIES

On the basis of this analysis each signatory would be required to maintain a national verification group. This need not be a separate permanent group established especially for this purpose, but could be an existing government agency with an environmental or health control function. It would need access to a selection of inspection personnel both technical and non-technical, but they need not be on permanent staff unless a variety of sites require routine periodic visits. The national agency would be responsible for all routine monitoring required by the treaty and for the provision of data and other pertinent information to the international control agency for exchange. If on-site visits and sampling were required either automatically for some activities or by challenge for others, all arrangements within the nation should be provided by the national agency. Whenever samples were to be taken this should be done in triplicate using standardized techniques so that they could be analysed nationally as well as independently in two designated laboratories elsewhere.

B. INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

For the international verification measures indicated in the preceding sections, technical or non-technical inspectors would be required for most activities; however the level of employment would not warrant placing these individuals on the permanent staff of an international agency. The most logical approach would be for each signatory to nominate one technical and one non-technical inspector who would then be available when needed. Similarly signatories could be encouraged though not required to designate a national laboratory where the analysis of samples could be carried out by standardized techniques on request.

On this basis an international verification agency need consist only of a supervisory (consultative) committee at the political level which would meet periodically or in response to a challenge, supported by a small secretariat. The committee would determine the verification measures to be carried out and arrangements would be made through the secretariat which would also provide for routine measures. From the foregoing analysis it is clear that much of the verification emphasis will be placed on challenge mechanisms and the treaty must specify them in some detail.

CONCLUSIONS

An analysis of verification requirements based on specific activities to be undertaken or banned under a treaty has suggested that the minimum levels needed for adequate assurance to the international community are not extensive and should be achievable by available means. However, it is clear that remote technical means will not provide the necessary measures and for most activities some form of on-site inspection will provide the only realistic evidence of compliance. For only one activity, stockpile destruction, inspections have to involve a significant level of intrusiveness. In all cases, for publicity purposes, inspections should be to the advantage of the nation being inspected unless that nation has been guilty of non-compliance, or for some other unexplained reason denies an inspection.